



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,615	06/10/2005	Hirohata Suzuki	262520US6PCT	8515
22850	7590	05/07/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER PARK, EDWARD				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2624				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/07/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/517,615

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

EDWARD PARK

Art Unit

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) EDWARD PARK.(3) Mr. Edward Tracy (Reg #: 47,998).(2) Primary Yosef Kassa.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 21 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11 and 16-21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Schmid et al, Roehrig et al (US 5,815,591), Hull (US 5,832,110), Lowe, Matsuzaki et al (US 6,804,683), Watanabe et al (US 7,084,900).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative and examiners discussed prior art references and potential claim amendments in regards to claims 1, 11, 16-21. Agreement was reached in terms of newly proposed claim limitations overcoming the prior art of record. Furthermore, claims 16, 17 was discussed in regards to proposing claim limitations to overcome the 101 Tied-to-Criteria.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/YOSEF KASSA/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624